



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,133	03/25/2004	Joseph E. Firebaugh	4541-017/RSW920030293US1	7696
67419	7590	05/29/2009		
COATS & BENNETT/IBM 1400 CRESCENT GREEN SUITE 300 CARY, NC 27518			EXAMINER PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/29/2009 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,133

Applicant(s)

FIREBAUGH ET AL.

Examiner

Sathyannarayan Pannala

Art Unit

2164

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 14-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on 2/27/2009 with amended claims 1, 10, 15 and canceled claims 12-13. In this Office Action, claims 1-11 and 14-16 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-8, 10 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Darbie (USPA Pub. 2004/0205463 A1) hereinafter Darbie.

4. As per independent claims 1, 10, 15, Darbie teaches the claimed, a method of synthesizing large data sets to facilitate the use of an accessibility system (Fig. 1, 3,

par. [0009], lines 1-4). Darbie teaches the claimed, providing a large data set (Fig. 4, par. [0052], lines 7-8). Darbie teaches the claimed, formatting large data set in a markup language data structure (Fig. 4, par. [0010], lines 1-2). Darbie teaches the claimed, generating a synopsis of a large data (Fig. 4, par. [0011], lines 8-9). Further, Darbie teaches the claimed, formatting said synopsis of said large data set in a synopsis container that includes said large data set and said synopsis of said large data set (Fig. 4, 7, par. [0012], lines 8-11 and par. [0061], lines 10-13). Darbie teaches the claimed, transmitting synopsis container to a computer having an accessibility system (Fig. 2, 4, par. [0032], lines 10-12). Darbie teaches the claimed, the synopsis container operative to cause the accessibility system to output the synopsis of said large data set, rather than the large data set (Fig. 4, par. [0027], lines 1-5, it is easy to restrict printing only the synopsis of a large data set).

The other limitations of claim 10 are:

Darbie teaches the claimed, generating a data structure initial tag and terminating tag (Fig. 6, 7, par. [0057], lines 1-12 and par. [0063], lines 13-16).

5. As per dependent claim 2, Darbie teaches the claimed, providing a large data set comprises automatically generating said large data set in response to a user input (Fig. 4, par. [0028], lines 5-7).

6. As per dependent claim 3, Darbie teaches the claimed, providing a large data set comprises retrieving said large data set from storage in response to a user input (Fig. 2, 7, par. [0060], lines 9-14).

7. As per dependent claim 4, Darbie teaches the claimed, formatting said large data set for transmission comprises generating markup language data structures to direct the display of said large data set at a client terminal (Fig. 2, 7, par. [0060], lines 9-14).

8. As per dependent claim 5, Darbie teaches the claimed, generating a synopsis of said large data set comprises automatically generating said synopsis by comparing data elements in said large data set to predetermined metrics (Fig. 2, 7, par. [0060], lines 14-25 and par. [0032], lines 5-9).

9. As per dependent claim 6, Darbie teaches the claimed, generating a synopsis of said large data set comprises writing said synopsis by an individual (Fig. 1, par. [0030], lines 1-5 and par. [0052], lines 14-17).

10. As per dependent claim 7, Darbie teaches the claimed, formatting said synopsis of said large data set in a synopsis container comprises generating a markup language data structure defining said synopsis container (Fig. 7, par. [0061], lines 8-10).

11. As per dependent claim 8, De Boor teaches the claimed, transmitting said synopsis container comprises transmitting a markup language data structure including said large data set and said synopsis (Fig. 1, par. [0032], lines 10-12).

12. As per dependent claim 14, Darbie teaches the claimed, outputting a markup language data structure data structure synopsisizing the large data set comprises outputting data formatted as a markup language data structure compatible with the Hyper-Text Markup Language (Fig. 1, par. [0033], lines 1-3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darbie (USPA Pub. 2004/0205463 A1) hereinafter Darbie, in view of De Boor et al. (US Patent 6,470,381) hereinafter De Boor.

15. As per dependent claim 11, Darbie teaches the claim 10 and does not explicitly teach generating attributes. However, De Boor teaches the claimed, computer programs are further operative to cause a computer to perform the steps of generating a flag attribute indicating whether or not a computer having an accessibility system should output said large data set (Fig. 7, col. 22, lines 34-52). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combine the teachings of the cited references because De Boor's teachings would have allowed Darbie's method to provide Internet access via the HyperText Transport Protocol (HTTP), in response to user selection of data items associated with content located on the Internet (col. 4, lines 16-18).

16. Claims 9, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darbie et al. (USPA Pub. 2004/0205463 A1) hereinafter Darbie, in view of De Boor et al. (US Patent 6,470,381) hereinafter De Boor, and further in view of Slotznick et al. (USPA Pub. 2002/0178007 A1) hereinafter Slotznick.

17. As per dependent claims 9, 16, Darbie and De Boor do not explicitly teach using a screen reader. However, Slotznick teaches the claimed, accessibility system is a

screen reader (Page 2, paragraph [0018]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combine the teachings of the cited references because Slotznick's teachings would have allowed Darbie's method to provide Text-to-speech browsers are also an expense for those in the lower socio-economic levels, frequently costing end users over \$100 (par. [0016], lines 11-14).

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/27/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- a) Applicant's argument stated as "Claims 12-13 are canceled, obviating the 32 U.S.C. 112 rejections."

In response to Applicants argument, examiner withdrawing the rejection based on the cancellation of claims.

- b) Applicant's argument regarding 32 U.S.C. 101 rejection stated as "claims 1, 10 and 15 are further limited to a computer having an accessibility system."

In response to Applicants argument, examiner withdrawing the rejection based on Applicant's argument.

- c) Applicant's argument regarding 32 U.S.C. 102 rejection of claims 1, 10 and 15 stated as "the synopsis of the large data set is output by the accessibility device rather than the large data set."

In response to Applicants argument, examiner disagrees. Because, restricting to output synopsis **rather than the large data** is a negative claim limitation added by Applicant to overcome the prior art. But it is very easy to control printing synopsis only when the prior art has the provision to output the synopsis and the large data.

d) Applicant's argument regarding 32 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claim 11 stated as "It has absolutely nothing to do with generating any flag attribute indicating a computer having an accessibility system to should output a large data set."

In response to Applicants argument, examiner disagrees. Because the flag to indicate the ability for printing synopsis. De Boor teaches the same in order to print the required document (see at Fig. 7, col. 22, lines 34-52).

Conclusion

19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2164

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (571) 272-4115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sathyanarayan Pannala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164

srp
May 27, 2009